

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/241,636

Applicant(s)

HEATH ET AL.

Examiner

Jeanine A Enewold Goldberg

Art Unit

1655

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2000 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance or a Notice of Appeal. Alternatively, applicant may obtain further examination by timely filing a request for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d).

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 (a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked.

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☒ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
Claim(s) allowed: None.
Claim(s) objected to: None.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10 and 12-62.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
11. ☐ Other:


JEFFREY FREDMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 1. NOTE: The amendment has not been entered because a further search would be required to evaluate the newly added limitations, "wherein the solid support has not contacted the biological material at the time of treatment" and "any unbound lysing reagent is removed from the solid support before the biological material is contacted with the solid support". These limitations were not presented previously and thus would require additional search.

It is also noted that Claims 54 does not have a positive process step which meets the preamble.

Claims 61 and 62 have been added which require that the lysing reagent is anionic. This limitation had not been previously presented nor searched.

The response asserts that the amendments to the claims overcome the rejections of Boom and Deggerdal, however, the amendment has not been entered and the arguments are thus moot.